



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

impressed with the development of the movement in Germany, which was now covered with a network of peace organizations.

The meetings at Bath on the 9th and at Weston-super-mare on the 10th were well attended and interesting. The former was presided over by T. B. Silcock, M. P., who deplored the enormous increase of the army and navy expenses in recent years, and the prevalence of false ideals of national greatness. But a change had come and the eyes of the nation were once more, he was glad to say, turned in the direction of peace, and he hoped that Great Britain would lead the way in the greatest of all reforms, the promotion of a peaceful policy between the nations of the earth.

G. P. Gooch, M. P., declared that war, though it had prevailed in the past, was not a necessary factor in human progress, but would be discarded as many other evils which had disgraced the past history of humanity had been. He deplored the periodic outbursts of bellicose passion, against which the peace workers found it difficult to contend successfully. But he was sure that the higher sense of mankind was steadily asserting itself, and that the new factors in internationalism would render the danger of war less and less.

At the Weston-super-mare meeting the speakers were Mr. J. H. Cox, who presided, T. B. Silcock, M. P., who was given great applause, and who emphasized the superior power of religious and spiritual ideals in working out the welfare and the peace of the world, Rev. Leonard Dalby, and Dr. W. Evans Darby.

The *Herald of Peace* reports that, in spite of bad weather, "the meetings were a marked success both in point of attendance, general interest, speaking, and notice by the press."

## War and the Spirit of Democracy.

BY REV. CHARLES F. DOLE.  
From "*The Spirit of Democracy*."\*

War, like crime or disease, is an anomaly in modern civilization. Here is the world-wide difference between the theories of ancient and of modern life. In ancient life war was a habitual part of the business of the nation. The regular work of the government was to be ready to slay men. The old habit was to look on foreign peoples as natural enemies. The democratic habit is to see natural friends in all nations. This is the underlying thought of our democracy. Whereas the governments in the old times actually kept on hand the war-engendering microbes of hate, jealousy, envy, suspicion, inhumanity, and war therefore always threatened to break out, like the plague in Bombay, it is the first duty of a modern state to get rid of these evil microbes. The great objection to the support of a huge military and naval establishment is not the cost nor the immediate peril of our liberties, but the established fact that the subtle germs of war—pride, antagonism, arrogance, jealousy,—thrive in the substance of a great war department as the bacilli of consumption thrive and multiply in a deposit of abnormal animal tissues.

Let us frankly consider certain varieties of possible war, with reference, not to imaginary problems or to the issues of earlier times, but to the actual conditions which

we see in our world of to-day. We may rule out altogether, so far as we in the United States are concerned, the necessity of war with a superior power, as, for example, for the defense of liberty. . . .

Moreover we have passed, we hope forever, though at vast cost, upon the problem of revolutionary secession from our union of states. No one fears civil war. Or, if bitter voices are sometimes raised in prediction of some coming crisis of industrial revolution, we ought by this time to know the one way certain to avert the approach of mischief; namely, to do justice in public and private, to develop a more generous humanity, and to foster the growth of the democratic spirit. There is in fact no subject, as there was in the days of slavery, which threatens seriously to afford the material of civil war. . . .

We have mainly to consider what possibility of righteous war there is with other equal and sovereign nations. Let us count upon the fingers of one hand all the nations with which the United States is likely to have any pretext for a bloody quarrel.

First of these nations is England, our own mother country. Through her colonial possessions, she is our nearest neighbor. For the width of the continent her Canadian border marches with ours. We have no better or more friendly neighbor. Our laws, institutions and customs are with slight differences substantially the same. Our people generally profess forms of the same religion. A thousand international links bind us more closely every day. For any thoughtful and humane mind war with England is too terrible and preposterous to contemplate. It would be the straight and almost contemptuous denial of the Christianity of a hundred thousand churches.

For what national interest could war with England be entered upon? Not for any possible pecuniary gain to either nation. Not for the acquisition of territory. There is not even the slightest boundary question anywhere in sight. There is no piece of land upon the earth whose lawful sovereignty stands in doubt that is worth fighting about for either nation. The vast mercantile and industrial interests of both nations are overwhelmingly against war. The sympathies of the great mass of the plain people of both nations are equally against it.

Must we then consider the possibility of war with England over some fancied insult or question of national honor? It is certain that the representative men of both nations have no slightest disposition to insult or prejudice or injure the people of the other nation. There has been immense gain in this respect in fifty years on both sides of the ocean. What now is national honor? It is not honor to be hunting for imaginary insult. It is not honor to look on one's neighbors with suspicion. It is not honor, worthy of civilized men, to be quick to take up arms and to fight and kill. Revenge is not honor. Is it not rather national honor to be humane and friendly? Is it not the part of the strong nation, as of the strong man, to keep a cool temper, to give and to expect justice, to maintain sturdy goodwill to all? . . .

Can we discover any reason for the apprehension of war with the republic of France? Here is a nation with which we have always had a tradition of friendship. An immense trade connects the two countries. Hosts of

\*"*The Spirit of Democracy*," by Charles F. Dole. New York: T. Y. Crowell & Co.

American travelers are always enjoying French hospitality and admiring French art, science and scenery. In no part of the world do American and French boundary lines touch each other, to furnish even the occasion for a quarrel. The interests of both people are growingly pacific and international. In no country is there a stronger sentiment among its leaders in favor of the peace of the world and against the brutality of war than in France. May we not safely say that, as regards the forty millions of Frenchmen, the United States does not require a single company of soldiers, or as much as a gunboat, to defend us against national injury or insult. In other words, we have no need to raise the question of the rightfulness of a war with France. Nothing but the most culpable folly and perverseness in the administration of both parties could allow a conflagration between them to kindle.

Much the same must be said with reference to the great and friendly empire of Germany. Millions of its people are among our most loyal citizens. What good German, or what respectable American, can think of war between the two countries as anything less than wickedness? We have no boundary questions or issues between us over the possession of territory. We respect each other's national qualities. Americans go to Germany for education. We are cousins by virtue of the common sturdy Teutonic stock. Raze all our fortresses to the ground, and there is nothing justly belonging to the United States which the most strenuous German warlord would dream of seizing. . . .

There are trade rivalries between us, some one suggests. And what is the proper settlement of trade rivalries? Does any trader or manufacturer on either side of the ocean want to settle their rivalries by the sword? Only soldiers, and very dull soldiers, think of carrying on trade by force. The merchant and the manufacturer know well enough that war ruins trade and brings industries into bankruptcy. It is said that trade follows the flag; it does not follow the battle-flag, but the flag of peace. Trade follows the progress of civilization, which war destroys. You can demonstrate by figures that warships are, like armies, a burden of taxation upon the normal trade of the world. There is not even the Old World excuse that they safeguard the ocean from pirates. In truth, even in the old days, trading ships took all risks and ventures, and penetrated and explored distant waters, where the ships of war only followed them. It is insane to suppose that Germany and America have any cause in their commercial rivalry to threaten each other with war. Their people simply do not want war. . . .

What shall we say of "The Colossus of the North?" Where can any one find a reasonable imaginary excuse for the United States to wage war with Russia. The traditionary relations between the two countries have certainly always been friendly. The willing sale of Alaska to the United States emphasized the friendly intent of the Russian government. The spheres of political action of the two nations are as nearly distinct as possible. A considerable trade binds the two together and is sure to grow larger.

It is said that Russia is an empire, and her rule tends to stamp out the individuality and freedom of subject races. True, few Americans could live under the Russian system. But Russia has only done on a larger and a

cruder scale what America has begun to do in a more refined way in the Philippine archipelago. Russia proposes to civilize, educate and unify wild and heterogeneous peoples. Russia wants sea power, as does America. Meanwhile Russia has been learning a fearful lesson of the futility of despotism. Daily the spirit of democracy, drawing all men together, penetrates to every town of this great empire. Men are reading modern books. Plain people are asking questions. New ideas are in the Russian air. Russia is now an autocracy, but the Russian people are already awaking from this apathy and are being heard from. Popular institutions are yet to come. Vast and profound forces are at work, which make for peace, and specially with the liberty-loving people of the United States.

There are those who raise their hands in fear before the bogey of a "Yellow Terror." But sensible Americans, who have watched the growth of Japan with friendly sympathy since the days of Commodore Perry, will not be frightened because Japan has joined the "civilized powers." The leaders of Japan, many of them educated in American colleges, have never shown jealousy or hostility against the people of the United States. Neither nation wishes anything that justly belongs to the other. The Japanese, ever willing to adjust themselves to modern conditions, are too intelligent to retrace their steps to barbarism and to set forth on an insane crusade to conquer the world.

We have named every great power for fear of a war with which the apprehensive or pessimistic military faction advise us to build warships and prepare for possible trouble. We have found good reasons in every case for expecting permanent peace, without the menace of mischief or insult from any of them. Neither beyond the great powers named is there a civilized nation in the world with which we have any business to think of fighting. Not even Spain, though she might feel natural resentment against us, is dreaming of war. She is happily rid of perplexities and burdens in the West Indies and in the East, of which we have relieved her. Is there left a government on the earth with which we do not and ought not to stand ready to adjudicate any possible grievance by the means now provided and sanctioned already by repeated use, through the Hague Tribunal? A hasty act, it is said, may precipitate war. With whom? With Italy? With Austria? The United States, we reply, does not propose to accept the precipitate scratching of a match by a fool or a drunken man as a reason to embroil the world in flames. We intend to put such a fire out before it can catch.

Let us sum up this chapter as follows: As no true man expects in our day to fight with another, and even when a grievance arises between them each is willing to wait for the sense of justice and honor in the other man to assert itself, and, at the worst, each is ready to put his case out to fair arbitrament, and needs no compulsion to do whatever the arbiter or the court orders; so no civilized nation ought to fight for its rights or honor with any other civilized people; so each ought to be ready to wait for just arbitrament; so at the worst neither should need to be compelled to abide by the decision of a reasonable tribunal. The more completely the spirit of democracy underlies civilized governments, the more will this opinion tend to prevail.

Meanwhile already the United States doubtless holds this vantage ground among all nations, that by reason of her vast strength she does not need to go armed or to expect quarrels. She can afford to carry out her own ideals, since no one seriously wishes to molest her. She can afford to lead the world in the methods of peaceful conduct, inasmuch as her power and her dignity are above the reach of petty insult.

### The Gentle Art of Making Enemies.

BY LUCIA AMES MEAD.

The thing of first importance which we need, if we would be secure against imminent outbreaks, is the knowledge that this is the most critical period in the world's history. Never were so many hundreds of millions of men consciously changing their political and industrial conditions; never a time when business interests were so complex and so far-reaching, so sensitive to the good or evil will, to the wisdom or folly of those who are not its managers. Now, for the first time in human history, owing to steam, electricity and the spread of democracy, world organizations and consequent security are almost within reach, yet the men who are skilled in the gentle art of making enemies seem to know nothing of the new hope and opportunity, and go on their way blithely scattering the firebrands of scare headlines and to talk war in the same manner as Governor Vardaman, Hoke Smith and Thomas Dixon have been scattering their firebrands of hate and disloyalty to the constitution. The power of suggestion is one that must be reckoned with. In Atlanta, it meant a score of innocent men massacred, nine millions of black people outraged, and our nation dishonored.

Another thing for the patriot to learn is that national danger is more a question of psychology than physics. The man whose opinion we need as to the trajectory of projectiles is not one whose training fits him to judge a *casus belli*. Let him stick to his last, and not meddle where he has no business. It is not for him to decide how much force our country needs for defense. The amount of defense required depends not on a nation's size or wealth, but upon its danger. San Franciscans, though less numerous and wealthy than Bostonians, find it necessary for the moment to have a committee on safety, and to sell 20,000 pistols to private citizens. We, being a little better organized, and not having had an earthquake on our hands, need nothing of the sort. Yet many of the men who are estimating our need of battle-ships, and are growing hysterical over the *Dreadnaught*, base our need of a duplicate upon our size and wealth, rather than upon our dangers. One would think that England's confidence in us in leaving three thousand miles of undefended territory between us and Canada was an unknown fact, when one reads much of the newspaper excited chatter. The *Dreadnaught* is not a vessel that our kin beyond sea will send against their best friend, so long as that Canadian border remains unprotected, as a guarantee of amity.

Defense must be measured by danger, and danger, as I have said, is chiefly a question of psychology, the very last subject that a man trained in maneuvering steel mechanisms and instruments of destruction is trained in. No wonder that the masters of these deadly machines are restless when there is nothing doing, and want "a

firm attitude" shown. That would make things lively, and would give them some trips in foreign waters, not to say promotions, if matters became more lively still. Their cry, of course, is for peace! The time has passed when it is good form to express delight in war. For the sake of decency, all warlike preparations must be declared to be in the interests of peace. "It is a state of mind very much to be dreaded," says Ruskin, "for a man not to know the devil when he sees him." The most dangerous devil whom the American people have to deal with to-day, because he masks himself under the form of the angel of peace, is the one who is engaged in making enemies for our country. What matters it if he be sincere. So, no doubt, were Alva and Philip II. So was Napoleon, devastating Europe for French glory. So, they would like to have us think, are the men who, "for the interests of race purity," are sowing suggestions of treason to the constitution and to the moral law. The man who will do the most in Congress next year to scare its members into hysteria over the "yellow peril" and the German bogey, and to demonstrate that the only way to peace is marked out by new squadrons, likewise maintains that Tuskegee Institute is a curse to the South. What boots it that he is sincere when his opinion on one subject is as dangerous and false to American principles as his opinion on the other?

The schoolmaster fifty years ago, who ruled with rat-tan and rawhide, was sincere in believing that the only way to maintain discipline was by force. To-day, no one of the hundreds of thousands of children in the schools of New York can be struck without the teacher being fined. Child nature has not changed, but a psychological study of the boy has revealed other methods of keeping peace in the school-rooms than threats of thrashing. The nation needs to study the schoolmaster's line of progress. It is cheaper to make friends than to fight enemies. The Kaiser, sending his brother to visit us, presenting Harvard with a Germanic museum, instituting an interchange of university lectureships, attending the opening lecture of the American, and leading in a cheer for President Roosevelt's courteous letter, is doing more to prevent war with us than by all the battle-ships he has built. The Anglo-German *rapprochement*, begun at the Lucerne Peace Conference last year, was a masterpiece of psychological strategy, spiking the guns of the jingo press in both England and Germany, and by suggestions of what both nations had in common, drawing attention from the petty jealousies and suspicions that were making a breach between two Christian nations.

President Roosevelt's tact and goodwill in preventing war in Guatemala and Cuba indicates that he needs no gratuitous advice from men who know not the first elements of statesmanship as to how to treat Japan. The last thing that these mischief-makers are thinking of is "a square deal." They know mathematics and physics, and can estimate armor plate, but cannot estimate human hearts and wills. Said a rear admiral of the United States, in the midst of the Boer war, to a friend of mine: "I tell you what England ought to do is to whip France; she could do it, and it would clear the air and be a good thing." Not a thought of justice or reason was in the mind of this defender of his country. To him war was a clever game, and the misery of millions a negligible